



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,034	09/19/2000	Elissa E. Carapella	042390.P6139	5981

8791 7590 04/09/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

CHANG, RICK KILTAE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3729

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/665,034

Applicant(s)

CARAPPELLA ET AL

Examiner

Rick K. Chang

Art Unit

3729

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/10/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-20 and 35-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 35,36,38,45,46 and 48 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-20,37,39-44,47 and 49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 10 February 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claims 35-36, 38, 45-46, and 48 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: they are drawn to Fig. 7.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 35-38 and 45-49 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

NOTE: Please provide reference numerals to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity. Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because in the middle of the abstract (“or couple to a bond pad on the top surface) contains the subject matter drawn to an alternative embodiment. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. The amendment filed 2/10/03 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the

Art Unit: 3729

original disclosure is as follows: Page 7 of the maked-up version of spec. recites that busses 24 and 26 are electrically isolated via clearance spaces 42, but Page 8 of the maked-up version of spec. recites that they are not.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

NOTE: Please provide reference numerals to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity. Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

Drawings

4. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheet of drawing, filed on 2/10/03 has been approved as to the changing the reference numeral. However, Fig. 5 contradicts the claimed limitation recited in claim 18, for example. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawing is required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawing will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show entered Page 8, last three lines of marked-up version of amended paragraphs. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 3729

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “mask is covering all the first surface of the bond shelf” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

NOTE: Please provide reference numerals to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity. Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

Claim Objections

7. Claim 44 is objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claim 40. Claim 40 and claim 44 are essentially duplicates of one another or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording. It is improper to have two claims which contain the same limitations, in the same application as one claim would be a substantial duplicate of the other claim.

NOTE: Please provide reference numerals to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity. Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and

Art Unit: 3729

specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 13-20, 37, 39-44, 47 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claims recite forming a housing which has a bond pad located on a first surface of a bond shelf. For example, in claim 18, it recites masking all surfaces of the bond shelf, but it fails to reserve an area of the first surface of the bond shelf to form 16. A small area of the first surface of the bond shelf should not be masked, because this area are used to form another bond pad as recited in claim 37, for example. Further, it is unclear whether the step of masking covers the bond pads formed on the first surface. Fig. 5 clearly contradicts the claimed limitations. There are too many discrepancies and it is unclear to the reader what is intended invention.

NOTE: Please provide reference numerals to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity. Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the

Art Unit: 3729

support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR

1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 13-14, 16-17, 37, 39, 41, 47 and 49, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whitehead et al (US 4,682,270).

Whitehead discloses a housing 1 with a die attached therein, 4 extends from top, side and bottom of the housing 1, forming and etching copper plating on the housing by substrative method (col. 4, lines 53-57), and plating gold thereon.

NOTE: Please provide reference numerals to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity. Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3729

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 15, 40 and 44, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehead et al (US 4,682,270) in view of Kenworthy (US 4,223,321).

Whitehead fails to disclose masking all surfaces of the bond shelf except for the second surface.

Kenworthy discloses disclose masking all surfaces of the bond shelf except for the second surface (col. 3, lines 56-59 and col. 4, lines 4-9) thereby forming fine pitch conductor patterns to electrically communicate with other electronic components mounted therein in the housing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Whitehead by masking all surfaces of the bond shelf except for the second surface to the Whitehead's housing, as taught by Kenworthy, for the purpose of forming fine pitch conductor patterns to electrically communicate with other electronic components mounted therein in the housing.

14. Claims 18-20 and 42-43, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehead et al (US 4,682,270)/Kenworthy (US 4,223,321), and further in view of Japp et al (US 6,073,344).

Whitehead/Kenworthy fail to disclose drilling a portion of the second surface of the bond shelf including the conductive strip.

Japp discloses laser drilling (30 and 32) a portion of the second surface of the bond shelf including the conductive strip (area 34 consisting of 26 and 12) thereby providing a clean

Art Unit: 3729

electrical isolation between two conductive areas without requiring deburing or other chemical treatment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Whitehead/Kenworthy by drilling a portion of the second surface of the bond shelf including the conductive strip to the Whitehead/Kenworthy's device, as taught by Japp, for the purpose of providing a clean electrical isolation between two conductive areas without requiring deburing or other chemical treatment.

NOTE: Please provide reference numerals to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity. Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-20, 37, 39-44, 47 and 49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection..

NOTE: Please provide reference numerals to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity. Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

Interviews After Final

16. Applicant note that an interview after a final rejection will not be granted unless the intended purpose and content of the interview is presented briefly, in writing (the agenda of the interview must be in writing) to clarify issues for appeal requiring only nominal further consideration. Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations will be denied. See MPEP 714.13 and 713.09.

Conclusion

17. Please provide reference numerals to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity. Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,


Art Unit: 3729

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rick K. Chang whose telephone number is (703) 308-4784. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 AM to 1:30 PM, Monday through Friday, except for maxi-flex day off (any one of working days).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter D. Vo can be reached on (703) 308-1789. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rick K. Chang', written over a horizontal line.

**RICHARD CHANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

RC
April 8, 2003